



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

**NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: Schwartz and Peek Minor Land Division (PMLD 20100019)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes to subdivide a 10.24-acre parcel into two single-family residential parcels. Parcel 1 would be 5.10 acres, and Parcel 2 would be 5.14 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION: end of Manzanita Forest Drive off of Placer Hills Road, south of the City of Colfax, Placer County

APPLICANT: George Wasley, GW Planning, 10936 Lovas Court, Grass Valley, CA 95945

The comment period for this document closes on **January 3, 2011**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx> Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Colfax Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132, between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

Published in Sacramento Bee on Friday, December 3, 2010



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ☐ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Schwartz and Peek Minor Land Division	Plus# PMLD 20100019
Description: The project proposes to subdivide a 10.24-acre parcel into two single-family residential parcels. Parcel 1 would be 5.10 acres, and Parcel 2 would be 5.14 acres.	
Location: end of Manzanita Forest Drive off of Placer Hills Road, south of the City of Colfax, Placer County	
Project Owner: Jonathan Schwartz, 22195 Placer Hills Road, Colfax, CA 95713	
Project Applicant: George Wasley, GW Planning, 10936 Lovas Court, Grass Valley, CA 95945	
County Contact Person: Lisa Carnahan	530-745-3067

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **January 3, 2011**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvc/NegDec.aspx>, Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Colfax Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Parcel Review Committee. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

Project Title: Schwartz and Peek Minor Land Division	Plus# PMLD 20100019
Entitlement(s): Parcel Map	
Site Area: 10.24 acres	APN: 071-121-021
Location: end of Manzanita Forest Drive off of Placer Hills Road, south of the City of Colfax, Placer County	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The project consists of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a 10.24-acre parcel into two single-family residential parcels. Parcel 1 would be 5.10 acres, and Parcel 2 would be 5.14 acres. A driveway of approximately 160 feet with a County standard hammer head turn around would be constructed between the two parcels. There are currently two existing wells; one on each proposed parcel, as well as three County-approved Minimum Useable Sewage Disposal Areas (MUSDA'S) - one on Parcel 1 and two on Parcel 2. According to the application, there are no slopes of 30% or greater within either of the proposed building envelopes. Each of the proposed building envelopes is situated outside of the required setbacks, and each parcel contains an area where no building is allowed.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The project site is currently undeveloped with the exception of the existing wells. The site is located at an elevation of approximately 2,300 feet, and is characterized primarily by Ponderosa pines, Manzanita bushes and a few Oak trees. No waters of the State occur within the project site. The closest body of water is an unnamed creek located approximately 800 feet to the east, near Placer Hills Road.

The project is within the boundaries of the Colfax General Plan (1990). The project site is identified within the community plan as having a land use designation of Ranchette, 2.5 – 20 acre minimum. Parcel 1 is zoned F-B-100 PD = .4 (Farm, combining Minimum Lot Size of 100,000 square-feet, Planned Development with .4 houses/acre),

while Parcel 2 is zoned F-B-43 PD = 1 (Farm, combining Minimum Lot Size of 43,000 square-feet, Planned Development with 1 house/acre). The project as proposed is consistent with the Community Plan and Zoning designation.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan/ Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	Farm combining Building Site of 100,000 square feet (2.3 acres) minimum, Planned Residential Development of .4 houses/acre (F-B-100 PD = .4) and Farm combining Building Site of 43,560 square feet (1 acre) minimum, Planned Residential Development of 1 house/acre (F-B-43 PD = 1)	Colfax Community Plan Ranchette, 2.5 – 20 acre minimum	Unimproved with exception of wells
North	F-B-100 PD = .4	same as project site	Single Family Rural Residential
South	F-B-43 PD = 1	same as project site	Single Family Rural Residential
East	F-B-43 PD = 1	same as project site	Single Family Rural Residential
West	F-B-100 PD = .4	same as project site	Undeveloped

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Colfax Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Items I-1,2:

The project site is not located within a scenic vista or within a state scenic highway and will not damage any known scenic resources.

Discussion- Item I-3:

The existing visual characteristics of the project site will not be substantially altered by the project. Most of the adjacent properties have already been developed with single-family residences. The proposed project involves dividing the existing parcel into two single-family residential parcels. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-4:

The creation of a new buildable parcel as a result of the proposed minor land division has the potential to create new sources of light. However, the light will be of the type generally associated with residences. As there will be a very low density of residential development, the amount of light and glare generated by these residences will not have a significant effect on nighttime views. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-				X

agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN)				
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Discussion- Items II-1,2,4:

The Placer County Important Farmlands 2008 map, published by the California Department of Conservation, classifies the land as “Other land not included in any other mapping category” and there are no agricultural operations located on or near the project site requiring the use of buffers. No loss or conversion of Farmland or livestock grazing land will result from any further development of the site as a result of this project. Further development of the site will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Discussion- Item II-3:

The land within the project site is zoned Farm, but the site is not currently being used for agricultural purposes and the parcel is not under a Williamson Act Contract.

Discussion- Item II-5:

Further development of the site as a result of this project will not cause the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)		X		
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)		X		
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:

The project is located within the Mountain Counties Air Basin (MCAB) portion of Placer County. The project proposes a minor land division to create one additional parcel consistent with the land use designation of single family residential. The increase in density resulting from one parcel would not contribute a significant impact to Region, as the related emissions would be below the significant level. The project will not result in a significant obstruction to the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

The MCAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO_x) and non-attainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).

Construction of the project will include on-site road improvements which may result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel PM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. In order to reduce construction related air emissions, associated grading plans shall list the District's Rules and State Regulations. A Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the Placer County Air Pollution Control District for approval prior to the commencement of earth disturbing activities demonstrating all proposed measures to reduce air pollutant emissions. Operational related emissions would result from a single potential residence. The residence would be below the significant level and will not violate air quality

standards or substantially contribute to existing air quality violations. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures and notes on the grading improvement plans, construction related emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any non-attainment criteria.

Mitigation Measures- Items III-2,3:

MM III.1

1. Prior to approval of Grading or Improvement Plans, (whichever occurs first), on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. If APCD does not respond within twenty (20) days of the plan being accepted as complete, the plan shall be considered approved. The applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by APCD, to the local jurisdiction (city or county) that the plan has been submitted to APCD. It is the responsibility of the applicant to deliver the approved plan to the local jurisdiction. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval, of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit.
- 2a. In order to control dust, operational watering trucks shall be on site during construction hours. In addition, dry, mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Watering of a construction site shall be carried out in compliance with all pertinent APCD rules (or as required by ordinance within each local jurisdiction).
- 2b. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction) if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. *(Based on APCD Rule 228 / section 401.5)*
- 2c. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall apply water or use other method to control dust impacts offsite. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. *(Based on APCD Rule 228 / section 401.1, 401.4)*
3. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less. *(Based on APCD Rule 228 / section 401.5)* (
4. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive and dust is impacting adjacent properties. *(Based on APCD Rule 228)*
5. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: In order to minimize wind driven dust during construction, the prime contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction). *(Based on APCD Rule 228 / section 402)*
6. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time. Lime or other drying agents utilized to dry out wet grading areas shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. *(Based on APCD Rule 228)*
7. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified by APCD to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. *(Based on APCD Rule 202)*
8. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere volatile organic compounds (VOC's) caused by the use or manufacture of Cutback or Emulsified asphalts for paving, road construction or road maintenance, unless such manufacture or use complies with the provisions of Rule 217. *(Based on APCD Rule 217)*.
9. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
10. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.
11. Include the following standard note on the Improvement/Grading Plan: During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site. *(Based on APCD Rule 310)*

12. Include the following standard note on all building plans approved in association with this project: Prior to building permit approval, in accordance with District Rule 225, only U.S. EPA Phase II certified wood burning devices shall be allowed in single-family residences. The emission potential from each residence shall not exceed a cumulative total of 7.5 grams per hour for all devices. Masonry fireplaces shall have either an EPA certified Phase II wood burning device or shall be a U.L. Listed Decorative Gas Appliance. *(Based on APCD Rule 225).*

Discussion- Items III-4,5:

The project includes minor grading operations would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel PM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Because of the dispersive properties of diesel PM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use, short-term construction-generated TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item IV-1:

According to the Biological and Wetlands Resource Assessment prepared on April 21, 2010 by North Fork Associates, only one special-status plant species, Brandegee's clarkia, has a low potential to occur in the subject area. The property does not contain suitable habitat for sensitive wildlife species, with the exception of nesting raptors. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, potential impacts to these species can be reduced to less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure- Item IV-1:

MM IV.1 A pre-construction rare plant survey shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period to determine whether project activities would affect any individual Brandegee's clarkia specimens.

If development activities are anticipated during the nesting season for raptors (March 1 to August 15), a pre-construction raptor nesting survey is recommended no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction for all suitable habitats within 500 feet of the project site. If active nests are identified, construction activities should not occur within 500 feet of the nest, or up to 0.5-mile for active Swainson's hawk nests. A qualified biologist should monitor the active nest until the young have fledged, or until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active, or if it is reasonable that construction-related activities are not disturbing nesting behaviors. If construction activities are proposed to occur during the non-breeding season (October 1 through February 28), no further mitigation is necessary.

Discussion- Items IV-2,6:

Other than a potential for Brandegee's clarkia and nesting raptors to be present, the project site is not known to contain any other species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

The project site does not contain oak woodlands and therefore will have no impact to these resources.

Discussion- Items IV-4,5:

The report by North Fork Associated did not identify any waters within the study area that would be considered under the jurisdiction of Federal or State Agencies or Placer County.

Discussion- Items IV-7,8:

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project site is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X

6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	----------	--

Discussion- Item V-1:

A Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared for the property owner by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) on April 1, 2010. The report determined that there was a low to moderate potential of discovering prehistoric or ethnohistoric-period Native American sites in the project area. The following standard condition of approval wording will be placed on improvement/grading plans to ensure that no significant impacts to undiscovered archeological resources will occur:

"If any development activities associated with this lot split should uncover artifacts, bone or exotic rock (particularly obsidian), then a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to examine the deposit to determine its nature and significance. State law requires that if bone is discovered which might be human, the County Coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner determines that the bone is Native American in origin, he will contact the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento to identify the most likely descendants and develop appropriate measures."

No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items V-2,3,4,5:

According to the NCIC report, the proposed project area contains no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period resources listed with the California Historical Resources Information System or historic buildings, structures or objects. The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known unique archeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy any known unique paleontological resource, nor will it affect any existing religious or ethnic uses.

Discussion- Item V-6:

The project will not disturb any known human remains, including those that are located outside of a formal cemetery. However, there is the possibility that undiscovered resources may be found in the course of project development work. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(e), the following standard condition of approval wording will be placed on improvement plans to ensure that no significant impacts to undiscovered archeological resources will occur:

"If any archeological resources artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a County approved professional archeologist shall be retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and the Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archeological find(s)."

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect will be included in the general notes section of the Improvement Plans for the project."

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site and/or additional mitigation measures necessary to address the unique sensitive nature of the site."

No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	

4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)			X	
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)			X	
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)			X	
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

Discussion- Items VI-1,4,9:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on soils classified as Mariposa – Rock outcrop complex. The only identified soil constraints are the slope of the soil (greater than 15%) and the depth to bedrock. The Soil Survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features for the Mariposa soil type and did not identify any expansive soil limitations. Construction of two houses and a paved shared driveway will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Items VI-2,3,5,6:

The project proposal will result in the construction of two new single family residences with improvements of an 18' wide shared driveway for approximately 200' (0.09 acres of disturbance). The proposed project improvements will generally be at the same grade as the existing topography. Also, any erosion potential will only occur during the short time of the construction of the improvements. Therefore, the impacts to soil disruptions, topography, and erosion are less than significant.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The project is located within Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the project site as a low severity earthquake zone. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The future residential units will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (APCD)			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (APCD)			X	

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the additional residents, on-site fuel combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, and fireplaces/stoves; and off site emissions at utility providers associated with the project's electricity and water demands.

The project would result in minor grading and one additional dwelling unit. The construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)			X	
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:

This project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling of hazardous materials. Project involves splitting a parcel two ways for single-family residential use which will not involve routine handling of hazardous materials.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

The nearest school site, Colfax Elementary School, is located more than four miles from the project location. Further, the project does not propose a use that typically would involve any activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result will not create a significant hazard to the public.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a known private airstrip.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

According to the California Department of Fire and Forestry Protection (2007), the project site is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone of the State Responsibility Area. The proposed land division would allow for the development of two residential units in an area that has the potential for wildfire danger. The site is within the area of responsibility of the Placer Hills Fire District and the applicant will be required to obtain a "will serve" letter from the District prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

The project will not create a health hazard. Use of the proposed parcels is for single family residential.

Discussion- Item VIII-9:

The project will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazard.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)			X	
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X

8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)			X	
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)			X	

Discussion- Item IX-1:

The project will utilize onsite individual water wells for each parcel and onsite sewage disposal systems for each parcel which are installed in accordance through permits obtained from Placer County Environmental Health Services (PCEHS). The location of the water wells are beyond the required 100-feet from the onsite sewage disposal systems. The water wells here are drilled in excess of 100-feet below ground surface and are protected from contaminants at the ground surface by sanitary seals and annular seals. The leach fields for the onsite sewage disposal system are located at two feet below ground surface. With the setback distances required by County Ordinances and California State Law and that the septic systems and water wells must be placed in locations approved by PCEHS, the likelihood of this project to violate any potable water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

The project currently has two wells that were drilled for the parcel split. Both of the existing wells meet the County standard for providing adequate water supply for the two proposed parcels. The project lies in a hardrock fractured water supply. It is impossible to quantify how much water will be yielded from a fractured water supply or how long any water well will be sustained. A single family dwelling is a low use as compared to an industrial use or an agricultural use. Thus, the potential to deplete the groundwater supply is considered to be less than significant in this case. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The proposed project includes the construction of a shared residential driveway and two single family residential homes. The driveway improvements will be located at their existing grade. The drainage patterns from the proposed construction will not be changed. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The proposed project includes the construction of a shared driveway improvement and two future homes. These improvements will add only a small amount of impervious surfaces, approximately 0.22 acres, as compared to the entire project area, over 10 acres. No downstream drainage facility or property owner will be significantly impacted. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The area of disturbance for the project improvements is relatively small, approximately 0.22 acres, as compared to the entire project area, over 10 acres. The proposed improvements will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

This project is not likely to otherwise degrade groundwater quality.

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year

flood hazard area and no flood flows will be redirected after construction of the improvements. The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:

This project is not likely to change the direction or rate of flow of groundwater. The project lies in a hardrock subsurface which is also known as a hardrock fractured water supply. Due to the nature of a hardrock water supply, it is very difficult to ascertain the longevity and sustainability of any water well located with this subsurface condition. In this case, the project proponent is proposing one water well for each of the two proposed parcels. The two wells, which have been drilled, meet the PCEHS standard for serving single family dwellings. This project will result in land use designations which would ultimately allow for a 10.24 acre parcel to be split into two parcels. Given the size of the proposed parcels, the hardrock fractured water supply and the use of each well for a single family dwelling, the likelihood of altering the rate or direction of flow is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-12:

The proposed project is located near the Bear River Canal, the Boardman Canal, and an unnamed creek located on the easterly side of Placer Hills Road. The proposed improvements will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			X	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items X-1,2,4,5,6,7,8:

The project site is undeveloped, with the exception of a well located on each proposed parcel. The project site is located in a rural residential community and is bounded by rural residential uses. Because of the rural nature of the project site and vicinity, the proposed project will not divide an established community.

The project is within the boundaries of the Colfax General Plan (1990). Parcel 1 is zoned F-B-100 PD = .4 (Farm, combining Minimum Lot Size of 100,000 square-feet, Planned Development with .4 houses/acre), while Parcel 2 is zoned F-B-43 PD = 1 (Farm, combining Minimum Lot Size of 43,000 square-feet, Planned Development

with 1 house/acre). This zoning is consistent with the Colfax Community Plan designation of Ranchette, 2.5 – 20 acre minimum. As a part of the Minor Land Division entitlement process, the parcels resulting from this subdivision will conform to all policies set forth by Colfax Community Plan and the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project will not result in the development of incompatible uses or the create land use conflicts, as the surrounding parcels have similar land use plan designations and are rural in nature.

The project site does not contain agricultural or significant timber resources and does not have any such operations on site. Therefore, the Minor Land Division will not affect any uses of this nature on or around the project site. Additionally, the project will not cause significant adverse economic or social changes, as the parcel map is consistent with the surrounding uses and nature of properties within the vicinity.

Discussion- Item X-3:

The site is not within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan or other approved Habitat Plan Area. The project site is located within Area 2 of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance, and is designated as outside the tree preservation zone. Although there will likely be some tree removal for the construction of future residences, the implementation of the Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements will reduce any potential impacts from future residential improvements to less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The Mineral Land Classification of Placer County (California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology, 1995) was prepared for the purpose of identifying and documenting the various mineral compounds found in the soils of Placer County. The Classification is comprised of four primary mineral deposit types: those mineral deposits formed by mechanical concentration (placer gold); those mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes (precious and base metals); those deposits formed by magmatic segregation (chromite); and industrial mineral deposits and other deposits formed by diverse processes (clay, shale, quartz and construction aggregate).

According to the Mineral Land Classification of Placer County, northerly trending, gold bearing quartz veins are located just west of the town of Colfax and gold mining in the vicinity took place at the nearby Rising Sun Mine. However, the site exists in an area of no known mineral resource significance [MRZ-4]. Therefore, approval of the Minor Land Division would not have an impact on known mineral resources.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)				X
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X

3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XII-1,4,5:

The project proposes a minor land division to create two separate lots, each of which contains a residential building envelope. Low density residential uses surround the project site and the addition of a residential parcel in the project vicinity would cause a negligible increase in noise. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of any known private airstrips. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Discussion- Item XII-2:

The project proposes the creation of one additional low density residential parcel which will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels. Additionally, the project will not generate a substantial amount of traffic that would significantly increase noise on the existing roadways.

Discussion- Item XII-3:

The noise generated by the project would be similar to that created by surrounding land uses, which are predominantly rural. Construction activities associated with the project may cause a temporary increase in noise levels in the vicinity. However, these noise levels would be temporary and would cease once construction activities end. No mitigation measures are required.

The following standard note will be required on Grading Plans and will reduce any potential impact from construction noise to less than significant:

"Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a Grading or Building Permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays, and shall only occur:

- a) Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)*
- b) Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)*
- c) Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm*

In addition, temporary signs 4 feet x 4 feet shall be located throughout the project, as determined by the Development Review Committee, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations."

Quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, such as a house under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well. The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

Development proposed by the project would result in a small increase in population in the immediate area, with the possible construction of an additional single-family residence. This growth in population would be minimal and would be consistent with the Ranchette, 2.5 – 20 acre minimum of the Colfax Community Plan. The parcel map will not result in the displacement of any existing housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Schools? (ESD, PLN)			X	
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN)			X	
5. Other governmental services? (ESD, PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The subject area is classified as a “Very High Hazard” fire zone. Fire protection for the area is provided by the Placer Hills Fire District. The potential additional residence resulting from this Minor Land Division will not have a significant impact to the services provided requiring improvement or construction of additional facilities.

Prior to recordation, the applicant is required to submit a will-serve letter from the Fire District stating that the project as proposed meets all District requirements for water and/or road systems, and any other existing regulations. Impacts to these services would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The Placer County Sheriff's Department would provide law enforcement services. The addition of one extra residence would create a minimal demand on the Sheriff's Department and would not create a need for physically altered or newly constructed facilities. Impacts to these services would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-3:

The project site is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Placer Hills Elementary School District, Placer Union High School District, and Sierra College TA-5 district. The proposed project is consistent with the underlying land use designation of Ranchette, 2.5 – 20 acre minimum and will not result in additional demand on these school districts necessitating the addition or alteration of new school facilities. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-4:

The residential lots have access from a privately maintained roadway and no additional access requirements are necessary. Therefore, the project will not impact the maintenance of public facilities. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-5:

There are no other known governmental services that will be impacted by the project.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)			X	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XV-1:

The project proposes to subdivide an existing vacant parcel with one building right into two parcels with a proposed residential use for each newly created parcel. Although the intent for an additional residence is not known at this time, the result of one additional residence will slightly increase the need for additional park and recreation facilities. As with most new residential developments, a fee is collected or other amenities are required to offset additional demands on recreational facilities. Since the project would create a minimal increase in demand on recreational facilities, a fee to off-set this impact will be collected prior to map recordation and at building permit issuance. With the collection of this fee, impacts related to recreational fees would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-2:

The project will not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)			X	
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such				X

facilities? (ESD)				
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XV-1,2:

This project proposal will ultimately result in the construction of one additional residential single family parcels. The proposed project will generate approximately one additional PM peak hour trips and approximately 10 average daily trips. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. With the project traffic added to the existing traffic volumes, all area roadway segments and intersections will continue to operate within acceptable LOS standards. For potential cumulative traffic impacts, the Placer County General Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program, which with payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, will help reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items XV-1,2:

MM XV.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Auburn / Bowman), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current estimated fee is \$3,227 per single family residential unit. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion- Item XV-3:

The project proposes to construct a shared driveway improvement that connects onto the existing Manzanita Forest Court. The driveway will meet Placer County standards and include a vehicle hammerhead turnaround and the end. Therefore, there is no impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-4:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any impacts. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XV-5:

Future development on the project site will be required to meet the parking requirements as set forth in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. Given the size of the proposed parcels, there would be adequate area to accommodate the required off-street parking space without difficulty. Impacts to transportation and traffic would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-6:

The proposed project will be constructing driveway improvements that do not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XV-7:

The proposed project will not conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XV-8:

The proposed project will not change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)			X	
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)			X	
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)				X
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)			X	

Discussion- Items XVII-1,2,6:

The proposed project will utilize private wells and private septic systems to provide the water and sewer service. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

The project will result in the construction of new on-site sewage disposal systems. Soils testing has been conducted by a qualified consultant and reports submitted showing the types of septic systems required on each of the proposed parcels that will adequately treat the sewage effluent generated by the project. A total of two sewage disposal systems will be located on a total parcel area of 10.24 acres in size and thus the impacts from these septic systems is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

Storm water will be collected and conveyed in the existing drainage facilities. The existing system has the capacity to accept flows from the proposed project since the proposed project will only generate a minor increase in flows from the pre development condition. No new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-5:

The project currently has two existing water wells drilled by permit through Placer County Environmental Health Services. The yields on the existing wells are high enough that no storage tanks are required. The location of the project is in an area of high yielding wells. There is sufficient water available to serve this project as the two existing wells meet the minimum standards set forth the by PCEHS for water supply to serve each parcel. Thus, the concern about whether this parcel has sufficient water available for this project is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-7:

The project lies in an area of the County that is served by the local franchised refuse hauler and is served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity. The concern whether this project is served by a landfill with sufficient capacity is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, Lisa Carnahan, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Phillip A. Frantz
 Environmental Engineering & Utilities, Janelle Heinzler
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Environmental Health Services, Mohan Ganapathy
 Air Pollution Control District, Angel Rinker
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
 Placer County Fire/CDF, Bob Eicholtz/Brad Albertazzi

Signature Michael Wells Date November 22, 2010
 Michael Wells, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____

	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____

